arXiv:1406.1453v1 [math.RT] 5 Jun 2014

June 5, 2014

ON LUSZTIG'S q-ANALOGUES OF ALL WEIGHT MULTIPLICITIES OF A REPRESENTATION

DMITRI I. PANYUSHEV

INTRODUCTION

The ground field $\Bbbk$ is algebraically closed and of characteristic zero. Let G be a connected semisimple algebraic group, and T a maximal torus inside a Borel subgroup B. Write $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t}$, and $\mathfrak{b}$ for their Lie algebras. If $\mathbb{V}$ is a finite-dimensional rational G-module, then $\mathbb{V} = \oplus_{\mu\in\mathfrak{t}^*}\mathbb{V}^\mu$ is the weight decomposition with respect to T (or $\mathfrak{t}$). If $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}_\lambda$ is a simple G-module with highest weight λ, then $m^\mu_\lambda = \dim(\mathbb{V}^\mu_\lambda)$. In this article, we present some results on Lusztig's q-analogues $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ of weight multiplicities m^μ_λ. The polynomial $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ is defined algebraically as an alternating sum over the Weyl group, through the q-analogue of Kostant's partition function. Initially, Lusztig introduced q-analogues only for dominant weights μ [17, (9.4)]. However, this constraint is unnecessary and $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ is a non-trivial polynomial for any μ such that $\lambda - \mu$ is a linear combination of positive roots with nonnegative coefficients; in particular, for all weights of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$. A relationship with certain Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials [14] implies that $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ has nonnegative coefficients whenever μ is dominant. For instance, if $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ has the zero weight, with $m^0_\lambda = n$, then $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) = \sum_{i=1}^n q^{m_i(\lambda)}$ and $m_1(\lambda), \dots, m_n(\lambda)$ are the *generalised exponents* of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$. These numbers were first considered by Kostant [16, n. 5] in connection with the graded G-module structure of the ring $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}]$, where $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is the nilpotent cone. The interpretation of Kostant's generalised exponents via polynomials $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q)$ is due to W. Hesselink [12] and D. Peterson (unpublished).

In Section 1, we gather basic properties of polynomials $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ and recall their relationship to cohomology of line bundles on $G \times_B \mathfrak{u}$. We emphasise the role of results of Broer on the non-negativity of coefficients of $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ [4] and the induction lemma for computing $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ [5]. Using Broer's results allows us to quickly recover some known results on coefficients of degenerate Cherednik kernel that appear in work of Bazlov, Ion, and Viswanath [3, 13, 21]. We also prove that $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q+1)$ is a polynomial in q with nonnegative coefficients.

In Section 2, $\mathfrak{g}$ is assumed to be simple, and then θ is the highest root. We determine Lusztig's q-analogues for all roots of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbb{V}_\theta$. Furthermore, if $\mathfrak{g}$ has two root lengths,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B10, 17B20, 20G10.

Part of this work was done while I was visiting the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität (Jena) in Spring 2013.

then the short dominant root θ_s determines a representation that is called *little adjoint*, and we also compute q-analogues for all weights of $\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}$. Then we obtain a formula for the weighted sum $\sum_\mu m^\mu_\theta \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\theta(q)$, which implies that it depends only on $\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q)$ and the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$. A similar result is valid for $\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}$.

In Section 3, we prove that, for any simple G-modules $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ and $\mathbb{V}_\gamma$, the sum $\sum_\mu m^\mu_\gamma \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ is equal to the q-analogue of the zero weight multiplicity for the (reducible) G-module $\mathbb{V}_\lambda \otimes \mathbb{V}^*_\gamma$ (Theorem 3.2). Therefore, $\sum_\mu m^\mu_\gamma \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) = \sum_\mu m^\mu_\lambda \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\gamma(q)$ and this also provides another formula for the $\mathbb{Z}[q]$-valued symmetric bilinear form on the character ring of $\mathfrak{g}$ that was introduced by R. Gupta (Brylinski) in [10]. As a by-product, we obtain that such a weighted sum is always a polynomial with non-negative coefficients. Comparing two formulae for $\sum_\mu m^\mu_{\theta_s} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_{\theta_s}(q)$ yields a curious identity involving the Poincaré polynomial for W_{θ_s}, the Weyl group stabiliser of θ_s, and $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)$ (Corollary 3.6). We hope that there ought to be other interesting results pertaining to q-analogues of all weights of a representation.

If $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple and η_i is the number of positive roots of height i, then the partition formed by the exponents of $\mathfrak{g}$ is dual (conjugate) to the partition formed by the η_i's, see [15, 13, 21]. Section 4 contains a geometric explanation and generalisation to this result. Let $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ be a principal nilpotent element. We prove that if $\dim \mathbb{V}^e_\lambda = \dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}}_\lambda$, then the 'positive' weights of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ exhibit the similar phenomenon relative to the generalised exponents of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$.

Main notation. Throughout, G is a connected semisimple algebraic group with $\operatorname{Lie} G = \mathfrak{g}$. We fix a Borel subgroup B and a maximal torus $T \subset B$, and consider the corresponding triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{u}^-$, where $\operatorname{Lie} B = \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t}$. Then

– Δ is the *root system* of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$, Δ^+ is the set of positive roots corresponding to $\mathfrak{u}$, $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ is the set of simple roots in Δ^+, and $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\mu\in\Delta^+} \mu$;

– $\mathfrak{X}$ is the lattice of integral weights of T and $\mathfrak{t}^*_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the $\mathbb{Q}$-vector subspace of $\mathfrak{t}^*$ generated by $\mathfrak{X}$, $Q = \oplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i \subset \mathfrak{X}$ is the *root lattice*, and Q_+ is the monoid generated by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$. If $\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i\alpha_i \in Q_+$, then $\mathsf{ht}(\gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i$ is the *height* of γ.

– $\mathfrak{X}_+$ is the monoid of dominant weights and $\varphi_i \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ is the fundamental weight corresponding to $\alpha_i \in \Pi$;

– W is the *Weyl group* of $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$ and $(\ ,\ )$ is a W-invariant positive-definite inner product on $\mathfrak{t}^*_{\mathbb{Q}}$. As usual, $\mu^\vee = 2\mu/(\mu, \mu)$ is the coroot for $\mu \in \Delta$.

– If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, then $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ is the simple G-module with highest weight λ, $\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda$ is its dual, and $\lambda^* \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ is defined by $\mathbb{V}_{\lambda^*} = \mathbb{V}^*_\lambda$.

For $\alpha \in \Pi$, we let s_α denote the corresponding simple reflection in W. If $\alpha = \alpha_i$, then we also write $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$. The *length function* on W with respect to $s_1, \dots, s_r$ is denoted by ℓ.

1. Generalities on q-analogues of weight multiplicities

If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, then $\mathbb{V}_\lambda^\mu$ is the μ-weight space of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$, $m_\lambda^\mu = \dim \mathbb{V}_\lambda^\mu$, and $\chi_\lambda = \mathsf{ch}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda) = \sum_\mu m_\lambda^\mu e^\mu \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{X}]$ is the *character* of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$. Let $\varepsilon(w) = (-1)^{\ell(w)}$ be the sign of $w \in W$. By Weyl's character formula, $\mathsf{ch}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda) = \dfrac{\sum_{w\in W} \varepsilon(w) e^{w(\lambda+\rho)}}{e^\rho \prod_{\gamma\in\Delta^+}(1-e^{-\gamma})}$. For $\mu, \gamma \in \mathfrak{X}$, we write $\mu \preccurlyeq \gamma$, if $\gamma - \mu \in Q_+$.

Define functions $\mathcal{P}_q(\mu)$ by the equation

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{\alpha\in\Delta_+}(1-qe^\alpha)} =: \sum_{\mu\in Q_+} \mathcal{P}_q(\mu) e^\mu \,.$$

Then $\mathcal{P}_q(\mu)$ is a polynomial in q with $\deg \mathcal{P}_q(\mu) = \mathsf{ht}(\mu)$ and $\mu \mapsto \mathcal{P}(\mu) := \mathcal{P}_q(\mu)|_{q=1}$ is the usual Kostant's partition function. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, Lusztig [17, (9.4)] (see also [14, (1.2)]) introduced a fundamental q-analogue of weight multipliciities m_λ^μ:

$$\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q) = \sum_{w\in W} \varepsilon(w) \mathcal{P}_q(w(\lambda+\rho) - (\mu+\rho)). \tag{1·1}$$

For series $\mathbf{A}_r$, these are the classical *Kostka-Foulkes polynomials*. Therefore, this name is sometimes used in the general situation. It is also known that $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$ are related to certain Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials associated with the corresponding affine Weyl group [17], [14, Theorem 1.8]. However, one needn't restrict oneself with only dominant weights μ, and the polynomials $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$ can be considered for arbitrary $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}$. It is easily seen that

- $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q) \equiv 0$ unless $\lambda \succcurlyeq \mu$;
- if $\lambda \succcurlyeq \mu$, then $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$ is a monic polynomial and $\deg \mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q) = \mathsf{ht}(\lambda - \mu)$; therefore, $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\lambda(q) \equiv 1$;
- $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(1) = m_\lambda^\mu$.

In particular, if $\mu \preccurlyeq \lambda$, but μ is not a weight of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$, then $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(1) = 0$ and therefore $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$ has negative coefficients. If μ is dominant, then the relationship with Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials implies that $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$ has nonnegative coefficients. The most general result on non-negativity of the coefficients of $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)$, whose proof exploits the cohomological interpretation, is due to Broer [4], see Theorem 1.2 below.

1.1. **A relationship to cohomology of line bundles.**

Let $\mathcal{Z}$ be the cotangent bundle of G/B, i.e., $\mathcal{Z} = G \times_B \mathfrak{u}$. Recall that the corresponding collapsing $\mathcal{Z} \to G\mathfrak{u} =: \mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is birational and $H^0(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Z}) = \Bbbk[\mathcal{N}]$ [11]. Here $\mathcal{N}$ is the cone of nilpotent elements of $\mathfrak{g}$. For $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}$, let $\Bbbk_\mu$ denote the corresponding one-dimensional B-module. We consider line bundles on $\mathcal{Z}$ induced from homogeneous line bundles on G/B, i.e., line bundles of the form

$$G \times_B (\mathfrak{u} \oplus \Bbbk_\mu) \to G \times_B \mathfrak{u} = \mathcal{Z}.$$

The (invertible) sheaf of section of this bundle is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\Bbbk_\mu)$. More generally, if N is a rational B-module, then

$$G \times_B (\mathfrak{u} \oplus N) \to G \times_B \mathfrak{u} = \mathcal{Z}$$

is a vector bundle on $\mathcal{Z}$ of rank $\dim N$ and the corresponding sheaf of sections (locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module) is $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(N)$. If $\mathcal{E}$ is a locally free $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$-module, then $\mathcal{E}^\star$ is its dual. For instance, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(N)^\star = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(N^*)$, where N^* is the dual B-module.

The cohomology groups of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(N)$ have a natural structure of a graded G-module by

$$H^i(G \times_B \mathfrak{u}, \mathcal{L}_{G\times_B\mathfrak{u}}(N)) \simeq \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} H^i(G/B, \mathcal{L}_{G/B}(\mathcal{S}^j\mathfrak{u}^* \otimes N)),$$

where $\mathcal{S}^j\mathfrak{u}^*$ is the j-th symmetric power of the dual of $\mathfrak{u}$. Set $H^i(\mu) := H^i(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\mu)^\star)$. It is a graded G-module with

$$(H^i(\mu))_j = H^i(G/B, \mathcal{L}_{G/B}(\mathcal{S}^j\mathfrak{u} \otimes \Bbbk_\mu)^\star).$$

As $\dim(H^i(\mu))_j < \infty$, the graded character of $H^i(\mu)$ is well-defined:

$$\mathsf{ch}_q(H^i(\mu)) = \sum_j \sum_{\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+} \dim \mathsf{Hom}_G\big(\mathbb{V}_\lambda, (H^i(\mu))_j\big)\chi_\lambda q^j \in \mathbb{Z}[\mathfrak{X}][[q]].$$

The reader is referred to work of Broer and Brylinski for more details [4, 5, 7].

Theorem 1.1 ([7, Lemma 6.1]). *For any $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have*

$$\sum_i (-1)^i \mathsf{ch}_q(H^i(\mu)) = \sum_{\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)\chi^*_\lambda.$$

A more general version of this relation, where $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is replaced with a B-stable subspace of an arbitrary G-module $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$, appears in [19, Theorem 3.8].

For $\mu = 0$, we have $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(0) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $H^i(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}) = 0$ for $i > 0$ [11]. Therefore, the sum $\sum_{\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+} \mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q)\chi^*_\lambda$ represents the graded character of $H^0(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}) \simeq \Bbbk[\mathcal{N}]$ [12].

For $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}$, we write μ^+ for the unique element in $W\mu \cap \mathfrak{X}_+$.

Theorem 1.2 (Broer's criterion [4, 6]). *The following conditions are equivalent for $\mu \in \mathfrak{X}$:*

(1) *$\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ has nonnegative coefficients for all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$;*
(2) *if $\mu \preccurlyeq \gamma \preccurlyeq \mu^+$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, then $\gamma = \mu^+$;*
(3) *$(\mu, \nu^\vee) \geqslant -1$ for all $\nu \in \Delta^+$.*

The equivalence of (1) and (2) is proved in [4, Theorem 2.4]; the underlying reason is that, for such μ, higher cohomology of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Z}}(\mu)^\star$ vanishes. The equivalence of (2) and (3) appears in [6, Prop. 2(iii)].

Remark 1.3. The required equivalence of (2) and (3) is correctly proved by Broer, but some other assertions of Proposition 2 in [6] are false. Namely, in part (iii) Broer claims the equivalence of certain conditions (a),(b), and (c), where (a) and (b) are just our conditions (2) and (3). But condition (c) must be excluded from that list. Moreover, part (ii) in [6, Prop. 2] is also false. A common counterexample is given e.g. by $\beta = -\varphi_1$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{r+1}$, $r \geqslant 2$. This β satisfies Broer's conditions (a) and (b), but not (c); and part (ii) also fails for β. More generally, if $\kappa \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ is minuscule, then $\beta = -\kappa$ provides a counterexample to Broer's assertions.

Recall that $m^0_\lambda \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+ \cap Q$. Then $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) = \sum_{j=1}^n q^{m_j(\lambda)}$ ($n = m^0_\lambda$) is a polynomial with nonnegative coefficients and the integers $m_1(\lambda), \dots, m_n(\lambda)$ are called the *generalised exponents* of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$. If $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple and $\mathbb{V}_\lambda = \mathfrak{g}$, then they coincide with the usual exponents of $\mathfrak{g}$ (= of W) [12].

1.2. **Broer's induction lemma and degenerate Cherednik kernel.** The following fundamental result of Broer is a powerful tool for computing q-analogues of weight multiplicities. Unfortunately, it did not attract the attention it deserves. Perhaps the reason is that Broer formulates it as a relation in "the Grothendieck group of finitely generated graded $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}]$-modules with a compatible G-module structure". However, extracting the coefficients of χ^*_λ, one obtains the following down-to-earth description:

Theorem 1.4 (Induction Lemma, cf. [5, Prop. 3.15]). *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$. If $\gamma \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $(\gamma, \alpha^\vee) = -n < 0$ for some $\alpha \in \Pi$ (hence $s_\alpha(\gamma) = \gamma + n\alpha$), then*

$$\mathfrak{M}^\gamma_\lambda(q) + \mathfrak{M}^{s_\alpha(\gamma)-\alpha}_\lambda(q) = q(\mathfrak{M}^{\gamma+\alpha}_\lambda(q) + \mathfrak{M}^{s_\alpha(\gamma)}_\lambda(q)). \tag{1·2}$$

In particular, for $n = 1$, this formula contains only γ and $\gamma + \alpha$ and one merely obtains $\mathfrak{M}^\gamma_\lambda(q) = q\,\mathfrak{M}^{\gamma+\alpha}_\lambda(q)$. Broer's proof of the Induction Lemma exploits the cohomological interpretation of Lusztig's q-analogues discussed above, and includes the passage from G/B to G/P_α, where P_α is the minimal parabolic subgroup corresponding to α.

Actually, the name "Induction Lemma" is assigned in [5] to a certain preparatory result. But, we feel that it is more appropriate to associate such a name with Broer's Proposition 3.15.

It is observed in [9, 5.1] that Lusztig's q-analogues $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ satisfy the identity

$$\sum_{\mu:\, \mu \preccurlyeq \lambda} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) e^\mu = \frac{\sum_{w\in W} \varepsilon(w) e^{w(\lambda+\rho)}}{e^\rho \prod_{\gamma\in\Delta^+}(1-qe^{-\gamma})} = \chi_\lambda \cdot \prod_{\gamma\in\Delta^+} \frac{(1-e^{-\gamma})}{(1-qe^{-\gamma})} = \chi_\lambda \xi_q\,. \tag{1·3}$$

Here $\xi_q = \prod\limits_{\gamma\in\Delta^+} \dfrac{1-e^{-\gamma}}{1-qe^{-\gamma}}$ is the *degenerate Cherednik kernel*, and for $\lambda = 0$ one obtains

$$\xi_q = \sum_{\mu\in Q_+} \mathfrak{M}^{-\mu}_0(q) e^{-\mu}. \tag{1·4}$$

Thus, the coefficients of ξ_q are certain Lusztig's q-analogues. As an application of the Induction Lemma, we easily recover some known results on coefficients of ξ_q, cf. Bazlov [3, Theorem 3], Ion [13, Eq. (5.35)], and Viswanath [21, Prop. 1].

Proposition 1.5. *If $\mu \in \Delta^+$, then $[e^{-\mu}](\xi_q) = \mathfrak{M}_0^{-\mu}(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\mu)} - q^{\mathsf{ht}(\mu)-1}$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on $\mathsf{ht}(\mu)$.

1) *Base*: if $\mu \in \Delta^+$ is simple, then it is easily seen that $[e^{-\mu}](\xi_q) = q - 1$.

2) *Step*: Suppose that $\mathsf{ht}(\mu) \geqslant 2$ and the assertion holds for all $\gamma \in \Delta^+$ with $\mathsf{ht}(\gamma) < \mathsf{ht}(\mu)$. Take any $\alpha \in \Pi$ such that $(\mu, \alpha^\vee) = n > 0$. Then $s_\alpha(\mu) = \mu - n\alpha \in \Delta^+$ and applying (1·2) with $\gamma = -\mu$ we obtain

$$\mathfrak{M}_0^{-\mu}(q) + \mathfrak{M}_\lambda^{-\mu+(n-1)\alpha}(q) = q(\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^{-\mu+\alpha}(q) + \mathfrak{M}_\lambda^{-\mu+n\alpha}(q)).$$

Since $\mu - \alpha$ and $\mu - (n-1)\alpha$ are also positive roots, of smaller height, using the induction assumption yields the desired expression for $\mathfrak{M}_0^{-\mu}(q)$. □

Remark 1.6. Bazlov and Ion work with the usual (2-parameter) Cherednik kernel, and then specialise their formulae to one-parameter case. They use the general theory of Macdonald polynomials, whereas Viswanath provides a direct elementary approach to computing coefficients of ξ_q. One can notice that Viswanath's note [21] contains implicitly an inductive formula for the coefficients of ξ_q. His argument basically proves that if $\beta \in Q_+$ and $s_i(\beta) = \beta - k\alpha_i$ ($k > 0$), then

$$\mathfrak{M}_0^{-\beta}(q) = (q-1)\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \mathfrak{M}_0^{-\beta+j\alpha_i}(q) + q{\cdot}\mathfrak{M}_0^{-s_i(\beta)}(q). \tag{1·5}$$

Actually, one needn't assume here that $s_i(\beta) \in Q_+$. If some of $\beta - j\alpha_i$ do not belong to Q_+, then the corresponding q-analogues are replaced by zero. It is a simple exercise to deduce (1·5) from (1·2) with $\lambda = 0$, and vice versa. [Left to the reader.]

Substituting (1·4) in the equality $\sum_{\mu:\,\mu\preccurlyeq\lambda} \mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q)e^\mu = \chi_\lambda\xi_q$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q) = \sum_{\gamma:\,\gamma\succcurlyeq\mu} m_\lambda^\gamma \mathfrak{M}_0^{\mu-\gamma}(q), \tag{1·6}$$

so that all q-analogues for $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ can (theoretically) be computed once we know enough coefficients of ξ_q and the usual weight multiplicities. But even for the adjoint representation, this approach requires more than merely the knowledge of $\mathfrak{M}_0^{-\nu}(q)$ for $\nu \in \Delta^+$. For, $\gamma - \mu$ need not be a root in the above formula. However, Eq. (1·6) has a curious consequence.

Lemma 1.7. *The polynomials $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(q+1)$ have nonnegative coefficients for all μ. If μ is a weight of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ and $\mu \neq \lambda$, then $\mathfrak{M}_\lambda^\mu(0) = 0$.*

Proof. 1) By the very definition of ξ_q, we have $\xi_q = \prod_{\gamma\in\Delta^+}\big(1+\sum_{n\geqslant 0} q^n(q-1)e^{(n+1)\gamma}\big)$. Whence all polynomials $\mathfrak{M}^{\nu}_0(q+1)$, the coefficients of ξ_{q+1}, have nonnegative coefficients. Using Eq. (1·6), we carry it over to arbitrary $\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+$.

2) By Weyl's denominator formula, $\xi_q|_{q=0} = \sum_{w\in W}\varepsilon(w)e^{w\rho-\rho}$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{M}^{\nu}_0(0)=\varepsilon(w)$ if $\nu = w\rho-\rho$, and is zero otherwise. Hence $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\lambda}(0) = \sum_{w\in W}\varepsilon(w)m^{\mu+\rho-w\rho}_{\lambda}$. For a weight μ of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$, the latter equals $\delta_{\lambda\mu}$ by Klimyk's formula, see e.g. [20, § 3.8, Prop. C].
[One can also refer directly to Eq. (1·1).] □

2. All q-analogues for the adjoint and little adjoint representations

In this section, $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, θ is the highest root, and θ_s is the short dominant root in Δ^+. Here we compute q-analogues for all weight multiplicities of the adjoint and little adjoint representations of $\mathfrak{g}$ and show that their sum depends essentially only on the q-analogue of the zero weight multiplicity and the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Let $m_i = m_i(\theta)$, $i=1,\dots,r$, be the *exponents* of (the adjoint representation of) $\mathfrak{g}$ and h the *Coxeter number* of $\mathfrak{g}$. We assume that $m_1\leqslant m_2\leqslant\ldots\leqslant m_r$, hence $m_1=1$ and $m_r = h-1 = \mathsf{ht}(\theta)$. In the simply-laced case, all roots are assumed to be short. That is, the argument referring to long roots has to be omitted if $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type A-D-E.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $\mu\in\Delta\cup\{0\}$, the polynomial $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q)$ depends only on $\mathsf{ht}(\theta-\mu)$, i.e., on $\mathsf{ht}(\mu)$. More precisely,*

(i) $\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q) = q^{m_1}+\ldots+q^{m_r}$;
(ii) *If $\mu\in\Delta^+$, then $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta-\mu)} = q^{h-1-\mathsf{ht}(\mu)}$;*
(iii) *if $\alpha\in\Pi$, then $\mathfrak{M}^{-\alpha}_{\theta}(q) = (q-1)\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q)+q^{h-1}$;*
(iv) *If $\mu\in\Delta^+$, then $\mathfrak{M}^{-\mu}_{\theta}(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\mu)-1}.\mathfrak{M}^{-\alpha}_{\theta}(q)$.*

Proof. (i) This is well-known and goes back to Hesselink [12] and Peterson. See also [13, Theorem 5.5] and [21, p. 2].

(ii) If $\mu\in\Delta^+$ is short, then $(\mu,\gamma^\vee)\geqslant -1$ for all $\gamma\in\Delta^+$ and therefore $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q)$ has nonnegative coefficients by Broer's criterion (Theorem 1.2). Since $\deg\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q) = \mathsf{ht}(\theta-\mu)$ and $m^{\mu}_{\theta}=1$, one has the only possibility for $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q)$.

If Δ has two root lengths and $\mu\in\Delta^+$ is long, then we argue by induction in $\mathsf{ht}(\theta-\mu)$. For $\mu=\theta$, one has $\mathfrak{M}^{\theta}_{\theta}(q)=1$. To perform the induction step, assume that $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta-\mu)}$ for some μ and $\mu\notin\Pi$. Then there is $\alpha\in\Pi$ such that $(\alpha,\mu)>0$ and hence $s_\alpha(\mu)\in\Delta^+$ and $\mathsf{ht}(s_\alpha(\mu))<\mathsf{ht}(\mu)$. Here $\mu = s_\alpha(\mu)+n\alpha$ with $n\in\{1,2,3\}$, and by the Induction Lemma (Theorem 1.4) applied to $\gamma = s_\alpha(\mu)$ we have

$$\mathfrak{M}^{s_\alpha(\mu)}_{\theta}(q)+\mathfrak{M}^{\mu-\alpha}_{\theta}(q) = q(\mathfrak{M}^{s_\alpha(\mu)+\alpha}_{\theta}(q)+\mathfrak{M}^{\mu}_{\theta}(q)).$$

For $n=1$, we immediately obtain that $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{s_\alpha(\mu)}(q)=q\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\mu}(q)=q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta-s_\alpha(\mu))}$. For $n=2$ or 3, we get the same conclusion using the fact that the roots $s_\alpha(\mu)+\alpha$ and $\mu-\alpha$ are short (and hence the corresponding q-analogues are already known).

(iii) Passing from $\alpha\in\Pi$ to $-\alpha$ (crossing over 0) is also accomplished via the use of the Induction Lemma. Since $s_\alpha(-\alpha)=-\alpha+2\alpha$, we have

$$\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{-\alpha}(q)+\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)=q(\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)+\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\alpha}(q)),$$

and it is already proved in part (ii) that $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\alpha}(q)=q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta-\alpha)}=q^{h-2}$.

(iv) Going down from $-\alpha$ ($\alpha\in\Pi$), we again use the Induction Lemma. First, we prove the assertion for all negative short roots using the fact that if $\mu\in\Delta^+$ is short and $\mu\neq\theta_s$, then there is $\alpha\in\Pi$ such that $(\mu,\alpha^\vee)=-1$ and hence $s_\alpha(-\mu)=-\mu-\alpha$. Afterwards, we prove the assertion for the long roots, as it was done in part (ii). □

Remark 2.2. The simplest formula for $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{-\alpha}(q)$, $\alpha\in\Pi$, occurs if $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sl}_{r+1}$, where there are only three summands. Namely, $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{-\alpha}(q)=q^{r+1}+q^r-q$. But for $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{sp}_{2r}$ or $\mathfrak{so}_{2r+1}$, $r\geqslant 2$, we obtain $\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{-\alpha}(q)=q^2+q^4+\ldots+q^{2r}-(q+q^3+\ldots+q^{2r-3})$.

The notation $\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ means that μ is a weight of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$.

Theorem 2.3. *We have* $\sum\limits_{\mu\dashv\mathfrak{g}}\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\mu}(q)=\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)(\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)-r+1)+\dfrac{\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)}{q}\cdot\dfrac{1-q^h}{1-q}$ *or, equivalently,*

$$\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathfrak{g}} m_\theta^{\mu}\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\mu}(q)=\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)^2+\frac{\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)}{q}\cdot\frac{1-q^h}{1-q}. \tag{2·1}$$

Proof. Since $m_\theta^{\mu}=1$ for $\mu\in\Delta$ and $m_\theta^{0}=r$, both formulae are equivalent. In fact, we compute separately the sums

$$\mathcal{S}_+=\sum_{\mu\in\Delta^+}\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\mu}(q)\quad\text{and}\quad\mathcal{S}_-=\sum_{\mu\in\Delta^-}\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{\mu}(q).$$

Recall that the partition $(m_r,\ldots,m_1)$ is dual to the partition $(n_1,n_2,\ldots)$, where $n_i=\#\{\gamma\in\Delta^+\mid\mathsf{ht}(\gamma)=i\}$ [15]. Therefore, Δ^+ can be partitioned into the strings of roots of lengths $m_1,m_2,\ldots,m_r$ such that the i-th string contains the roots of height $1,2,\ldots,m_i$. Then, by Theorem 2.1(ii), the sum over the i-th string equals

$$q^{m_r-1}+q^{m_r-2}+\ldots+q^{m_r-m_i}=\frac{q^{m_r-m_i}-q^{m_r}}{1-q}.$$

Since $m_i+m_{r-i+1}=m_r+1=h$, the total sum over Δ^+ can be written as

$$\mathcal{S}_+=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{q^{m_i-1}-q^{h-1}}{1-q}=\sum_{i=1}^{r}\frac{q^{m_i}-q^{h}}{q(1-q)}=\frac{\mathfrak{M}_\theta^{0}(q)-rq^h}{q(1-q)}.$$

Likewise, using the corresponding strings of negative roots, one proves that

$$\mathcal{S}_- = ((q-1)\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q) + q^{h-1})\cdot\frac{r-\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q)}{1-q}.$$

It then remains to simplify the sums $\mathcal{S}_+ + \mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q) + \mathcal{S}_-$ and $\mathcal{S}_+ + r\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q) + \mathcal{S}_-$. □

Similar results are valid for the little adjoint representation of G. Let Δ_s denote the set of all short roots, hence $\{\theta_s\} = \Delta_s \cap \mathfrak{X}_+$. Set $\Pi_s = \Pi \cap \Delta_s$ and $l = \#(\Pi_s)$. Recall that the set of weights of $\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}$ is $\Delta_s \cup \{0\}$, $m^0_{\theta_s} = l$, and $m^\mu_{\theta_s} = 1$ for $\mu \in \Delta_s$.

The following observation is a particular case of [13, Theorem 5.5], and we provide a proof for reader's convenience.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $(n_{1s}, n_{2s}, \dots)$ be the partition of $\#(\Delta_s^+)$ with $n_{i,s} = \#\{\gamma \in \Delta_s^+ \mid \mathsf{ht}(\gamma) = i\}$, in particular, $\eta_{1,s} = l$. If $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_l)$ is the dual partition, then $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) = q^{e_1} + \dots + q^{e_l}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 1.5 and (1·6), we have

$$\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) = \sum_{\gamma\in Q_+} m^\gamma_{\theta_s}\mathfrak{M}^{-\gamma}_0(q) = l + \sum_{\mu\in\Delta_s^+}(q^{\mathsf{ht}(\mu)} - q^{\mathsf{ht}(\mu)-1}).$$

Since $\#(\Pi_s) = l$, the term l cancels out and the coefficient of q^j equals $n_{j,s} - n_{j+1,s}$ for $j \geqslant 1$. On the other hand, the number of parts j in the dual partition also equals $n_{j,s} - n_{j+1,s}$. □

An easy verification shows that, for the root systems with two root lengths, the generalised exponents $e_1, \dots, e_l$ of the little adjoint representation are:

$\mathbf{B}_n$ – n $(l = 1)$; $\mathbf{C}_n$ – $2, 4, \dots, 2n{-}2$ $(l = n{-}1)$; $\mathbf{F}_4$ – $4, 8$ $(l = 2)$; $\mathbf{G}_2$ – 3 $(l = 1)$.

In particular, if $e_1 \leqslant \dots \leqslant e_l$, then $e_i + e_{l+1-i} = h$ for all i.

Theorem 2.5. *For any $\mu \in \Delta_s \cup \{0\}$, the polynomial $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_{\theta_s}(q)$ depends only on $\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s - \mu)$, i.e., on $\mathsf{ht}(\mu)$. More precisely,*

(i) $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) = q^{e_1} + \dots + q^{e_l}$;
(ii) *If $\mu \in \Delta_s^+$, then $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_{\theta_s}(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s-\mu)}$;*
(iii) *if $\alpha \in \Pi_s$, then $\mathfrak{M}^{-\alpha}_{\theta_s}(q) = (q-1)\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) + q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}$;*
(iv) *If $\gamma \in \Delta_s^+$, then $\mathfrak{M}^{-\gamma}_\theta(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\gamma)-1}\cdot\mathfrak{M}^{-\alpha}_{\theta_s}(q)$.*

Proof. Part (i) is the subject of Lemma 2.4. The proof of other parts is similar to those of Theorem 2.1. □

Theorem 2.6. *We have* $\displaystyle\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_{\theta_s}(q) = \mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)(\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) - l + 1) + \frac{\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q)}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}}\cdot\frac{1-q^h}{1-q}$ *or, equivalently,*

$$\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}} m^\mu_{\theta_s}\mathfrak{M}^\mu_{\theta_s}(q) = \mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)^2 + \frac{\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}}\cdot\frac{1-q^h}{1-q}. \tag{2·2}$$

Proof. Our argument is similar to that of Theorem 2.3. Since $(e_l, e_{l-1}, \dots, e_1)$ and $(n_{1,s}, n_{2,s}, \dots)$ are dual partitions, we present Δ_s^+ as a union of l strings of roots, where the i-th string consists of roots of height $1, 2, \dots, e_i$. Then, using the fact that $e_j + e_{l-j+1} = h$ for all j, one computes that the sums of q-analogues of weight multiplicities over Δ_s^+ and $-\Delta_s^+$ are equal to $\dfrac{\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q) - lq^h}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}(1-q)}$ and $((q-1)\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)+q^{\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)})\dfrac{l-\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)}{(1-q)}$, respectively. □

Remark 2.7. It follows from this theorem that $\frac{\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}}$ is a polynomial in q.

Remark 2.8. In the simply-laced case, we have $l = r$, $\theta = \theta_s$, and $h - \mathsf{ht}(\theta_s) = 1$. Then Theorems 2.3 and 2.6 yield the same formulae.

Remark 2.9. Recall that the singular locus $\mathcal{N}^{sg}$ of $\mathcal{N}$ is irreducible (and the dense G-orbit in $\mathcal{N}^{sg}$ is said to be subregular.) For any $\alpha \in \Pi_s$ and $\lambda \in Q \cap \mathfrak{X}_+$, Broer proves that the collapsing $G \times_{P_\alpha} \mathfrak{n}_\alpha \to \mathcal{N}^{sg}$, where $\mathfrak{n}_\alpha$ is the nilradical of $\operatorname{Lie} P_\alpha$, is birational and $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) - q^{\mathsf{ht}(\alpha^+)}\mathfrak{M}^{\alpha^+}_\lambda(q)$ is the Poincaré polynomial counting the occurrences of $\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda$ in the graded ring $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}^{sg}]$, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) - q^{\mathsf{ht}(\alpha^+)}\mathfrak{M}^{\alpha^+}_\lambda(q) = \sum_i \dim_\Bbbk \mathsf{Hom}_G(\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda, \Bbbk[\mathcal{N}^{sg}]_i)\, q^i$$

[4, Cor. 4.7]. In particular, $m^0_\lambda - m^\alpha_\lambda$ is the multiplicity of $\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda$ in $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}^{sg}]$. Using the Induction Lemma, we can prove that $q\,\mathfrak{M}^\alpha_\lambda(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\alpha^+)}\mathfrak{M}^{\alpha^+}_\lambda(q)$. Therefore, this Poincaré polynomial is also equal to $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) - q\,\mathfrak{M}^\alpha_\lambda(q) = q\,\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q) - \mathfrak{M}^{-\alpha}_\lambda(q)$.

For the long simple root α, the collapsing $G \times_{P_\alpha} \mathfrak{n}_\alpha \to \mathcal{N}^{sg}$ is not birational and the ring $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}^{sg}]$ should be replaced with $\Bbbk[G \times_{P_\alpha} \mathfrak{n}_\alpha]$.

3. A WEIGHTED SUM OF q-ANALOGUES OF ALL WEIGHT MULTIPLICITIES

For a (possibly reducible) G-module $V = \sum_j a_j \mathbb{V}_{\lambda_j}$, we set $\mathfrak{M}^0_V(q) = \sum_j a_j \mathfrak{M}^0_{\lambda_j}(q)$. In [10], R. Gupta (Brylinski) considered a $\mathbb{Z}[q]$-valued symmetric bilinear form $\langle\!\langle\ ,\ \rangle\!\rangle$ on the character ring of $\mathfrak{g}$:

$$\langle\!\langle \mathsf{ch}(V_1), \mathsf{ch}(V_2) \rangle\!\rangle = \mathfrak{M}^0_{V_1 \otimes V_2^*}(q).$$

She proved that this form has a nice expression via the q-analogues of *dominant* weights occurring in both V_1 and V_2. For any $\nu \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, consider the stabiliser $W_\nu \subset W$ and the restriction of the length function ℓ to W_ν. Set $t_\nu(q) = \sum_{w \in W_\nu} q^{\ell(w)}$, the Poincaré polynomial of W_ν. In particular, $t_0(q)$ is the Poincaré polynomial of W.

Theorem 3.1 ([10, Cor. 2.4]). *For all $\lambda, \gamma \in \mathfrak{X}_+$, one has*

$$\langle\!\langle \mathsf{ch}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda), \mathsf{ch}(\mathbb{V}_\gamma) \rangle\!\rangle = \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{X}_+} \mathfrak{M}^\nu_\lambda(q)\mathfrak{M}^\nu_\gamma(q)\frac{t_0(q)}{t_\nu(q)}.$$

We provide here another formula for this bilinear form that involves the usual weight multiplicities for one representation and q-analogues of *all* weight multiplicities for the other representation. Below, we write $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\lambda^*\otimes\gamma}(q)$ in place of $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\mathbb{V}_{\lambda^*}\otimes\mathbb{V}_\gamma}(q)$.

Theorem 3.2. *For all $\lambda,\gamma\in\mathfrak{X}_+$, we have*

$$\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\gamma} m^\mu_\gamma\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)=\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda} m^\mu_\lambda\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\gamma(q)=\mathfrak{M}^0_{\lambda^*\otimes\gamma}(q)=\sum_{\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+}\mathfrak{M}^\nu_\gamma(q)\mathfrak{M}^\nu_\lambda(q)\cdot\frac{t_0(q)}{t_\nu(q)}.$$

Proof. The last equality here is the above-mentioned result of R. Brylinski; the first equality stems from the symmetry of the last expression with respect to λ and γ. Hence our task is to prove the second equality. Consider the vector bundle $G\times_B(\mathfrak{u}\oplus\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda)\to\mathcal{Z}$ and the corresponding sheaf $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda)$ of graded $\Bbbk[\mathcal{N}]$-modules. As in case of line bundles on $\mathcal{Z}$ (see Section 1), the graded character of $H^i(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)^\star)$ is well-defined and we say that

$$\mathsf{gec}\,(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)=\sum_i(-1)^i\mathsf{ch}_q\big(H^i(\mathcal{Z},\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)^\star)\big)$$

is the *graded Euler characteristic* (of $\mathcal{L}_\mathcal{Z}(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)^\star$). Let us compute $\mathsf{gec}\,(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)$ in two different ways.

First, we can replace $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ with the completely reducible B-module $\widetilde{\mathbb{V}}_\lambda=\oplus_\mu m^\mu_\lambda\,\Bbbk_\mu$, which does not change the graded Euler characteristic. Then

$$\mathsf{gec}\,(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)=\mathsf{gec}\,(\widetilde{\mathbb{V}}_\lambda)=\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda} m^\mu_\lambda\,\mathsf{gec}\,(\Bbbk_\mu)=\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda}\sum_{\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+} m^\mu_\lambda\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\nu(q)\chi^*_\nu, \tag{3·1}$$

where the last equality follows by Theorem 1.1.

On the other hand, $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ is a G-module, therefore $G\times_B(\mathfrak{u}\oplus\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda)\simeq\mathcal{Z}\times\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda$ and

$$\mathsf{gec}\,(\mathbb{V}_\lambda)\simeq\mathsf{ch}(\mathbb{V}^*_\lambda)\cdot\mathsf{gec}\,(\Bbbk_0)=\chi^*_\lambda\cdot\sum_{\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+}\mathfrak{M}^0_\nu(q)\chi^*_\nu. \tag{3·2}$$

Now, equating the coefficients of χ^*_γ in (3·1) and (3·2), we will obtain the assertion. The required coefficient in (3·1) equals $\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda} m^\mu_\lambda\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\gamma(q)$. Expanding the product $\chi^*_\lambda\chi^*_\nu=\sum_{\kappa\in\mathfrak{X}_+}c^\kappa_{\lambda^*\nu^*}\chi_\kappa$, we see that the coefficient of χ^*_γ in (3·2) equals $\sum_{\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+}c^{\gamma^*}_{\lambda^*\nu^*}\mathfrak{M}^0_\nu(q)$. Since $c^{\gamma^*}_{\lambda^*\nu^*}=c^\nu_{\lambda^*\gamma}$, this sum also equals $\mathfrak{M}^0_{\lambda^*\otimes\gamma}(q)$. □

Corollary 3.3. *For any $\lambda\in\mathfrak{X}_+$, we have* $\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda} m^\mu_\lambda\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)=\sum_{\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+}\mathfrak{M}^\nu_\lambda(q)^2\cdot\frac{t_0(q)}{t_\nu(q)}.$

(Note that for $\nu\in\mathfrak{X}_+$, $\mathfrak{M}^\nu_\lambda(q)$ is nonzero if and only if $\nu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda$.) This equality shows that the weighted sum $\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda} m^\mu_\lambda\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ is a more natural object than just $\sum_{\mu\dashv\mathbb{V}_\lambda}\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$. Actually, we do not know any closed expression for the latter. Moreover, the weighted sum of q-analogues of all weight multiplicities is a polynomial with nonnegative coefficients, whereas this is not always the case for the plain sum (use Theorem 2.3 and look at the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{sl}_{r+1}$ with $r\geqslant 4$).

Remark 3.4. It was tempting to conjecture that Corollary 3.3 could be refined so that one takes the sum over a sole Weyl group orbit $W\mu$ in the LHS and pick the summand corresponding to μ^+ in the RHS. But this doesn't work! For instance, if $\mu = 0 \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda$, then the corresponding summands are $m^0_\lambda \mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q)$ (left) and $\mathfrak{M}^0_\lambda(q)^2$ (right).

Corollary 3.5. *1) If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+$ is minuscule, then* $\sum_{\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) = \sum_{\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda} q^{\mathsf{ht}(\lambda-\mu)} = \dfrac{t_0(q)}{t_\lambda(q)}$;
2) More generally, if $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$ is weight multiplicity free (i.e., $m^\mu_\lambda = 1$ for all $\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda$), then

$$\sum_{\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) = \sum_{\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda} q^{\mathsf{ht}(\lambda-\mu)}.$$

Proof. 1) In this case all weight multiplicities are equal to one and λ is the only dominant weight of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$. Moreover, all the weights μ satisfy the condition (3) of Theorem 1.2 and therefore $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\lambda-\mu)}$.

2) Since $m^\mu_\lambda = 1$ for all μ, using Theorem 1.4, one easily proves by induction on $\mathsf{ht}(\lambda-\mu)$ that $\mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q) = q^{\mathsf{ht}(\lambda-\mu)}$. □

This corollary shows that, for the weight multiplicity free case, $\sum_{\mu \dashv \mathbb{V}_\lambda} \mathfrak{M}^\mu_\lambda(q)$ equals the *Dynkin polynomial* of $\mathbb{V}_\lambda$, see [18, Sect. 3].

Corollary 3.6. *(i) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is simply-laced, then* $\dfrac{t_0(q)}{t_\theta(q)} = \dfrac{\mathfrak{M}^0_\theta(q)}{q} \cdot \dfrac{1-q^h}{1-q}$.
(ii) More generally, for any simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, we have $\dfrac{t_0(q)}{t_{\theta_s}(q)} = \dfrac{\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta_s}(q)}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s)}} \cdot \dfrac{1-q^h}{1-q}$ *and* $\dfrac{t_0(q)}{t_\theta(q)} = \dfrac{\mathfrak{M}^0_{\theta^\vee}(q)}{q^{h-\mathsf{ht}(\theta^\vee)}} \cdot \dfrac{1-q^h}{1-q}$, *where $\theta^\vee$ is regarded as the short dominant root in $\Delta^\vee$.*

Proof. In the simply laced case, $\theta = \theta_s$ and $\mathsf{ht}(\theta_s) = \mathsf{ht}(\theta^\vee) = h-1$. Therefore, it suffices to prove part (ii). For the first equality in (ii), we combine Eq. (2·2) and Corollary 3.3 with $\lambda = \theta_s$, and also use the fact that the only dominant weights of $\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}$ are θ_s and 0. The second equality stems from the similar argument for the dual Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ and the fact that $t_\theta(q) = t_{\theta^\vee}(q)$. □

Remark 3.7. The last corollary can be verified by a direct calculation. Recall that if $d_1(\nu), \dots, d_r(\nu)$ are the degrees of basic invariants of the reflection group $W_\nu \subset GL(\mathfrak{t})$, then $t_\nu(q) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \dfrac{1-q^{d_i(\nu)}}{1-q}$. In particular, $d_i(0) = m_i + 1$. It is a kind of miracle that the complicated fraction $\dfrac{t_0(q)}{t_{\theta_s}(q)} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \dfrac{1-q^{d_i(0)}}{1-q^{d_i(\theta_s)}}$ simplifies to rather a simple expression!

4. Generalised exponents and the height of weights

In Section 2, we used the fact that the generalised exponents of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathbb{V}_\theta$ and $\mathbb{V}_{\theta_s}$ are determined via the height of 'positive weights (roots)'. Here we provide a geometric condition

for this phenomenon and point out some other irreducible representation having the similar property. This relies on results of R. Brylinski on the principal filtration of a weight space and 'jump' polynomials [7].

Let e be a principal nilpotent element of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\{e, \tilde{h}, f\}$ a corresponding principal $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple in $\mathfrak{g}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that e is the sum of root vectors corresponding to Π and hence $\alpha(\tilde{h}) = 2$ for all $\alpha \in \Pi$ [15, 16]. This means that upon the identification of $\mathfrak{t}$ and $\mathfrak{t}^*$, $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{h}$ is nothing but $\rho^\vee := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\gamma\in\Delta^+}\gamma^\vee$ and $\gamma(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{h}) = (\gamma, \rho^\vee) = \mathsf{ht}(\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in Q_+$.

Let $\mathfrak{s} = \langle e, \tilde{h}, f\rangle$ be the corresponding simple subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We write $\mathcal{R}_n$ for the simple $\mathfrak{s}$-module of dimension $n+1$, so that the $\tilde{h}$-eigenvalues in $\mathcal{R}_n$ are $n, n-2, \dots, -n$.

In what follows, $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{V}_\lambda$, $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})$ is the set of weights of $\mathbb{V}$, and

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+ = \{\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V}) \mid \nu(\tilde{h}) > 0\}.$$

We also write $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+}$ for the *multiset* of weights in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+$, where each ν appears with multiplicity m^ν_λ. It is assumed below that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{X}_+ \cap Q$, so that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V}) \subset Q$ and $m^0_\lambda \neq 0$.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that* $\dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}} = \dim \mathbb{V}^e (=: n)$. *Then*

(i) $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+ \cup \{0\} \cup (-\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+)$; *moreover, each nonzero weight is a multiple of a root.*

(ii) $$\prod_{\gamma\in\widetilde{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+}} \frac{1-q^{\mathsf{ht}(\gamma)+1}}{1-q^{\mathsf{ht}(\gamma)}} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1-q^{m_i(\lambda)+1}}{1-q}.$$

Proof. (i) Considering $\mathbb{V}$ as $\mathfrak{s}$-module, we obtain a decomposition $\mathbb{V}|_{\mathfrak{s}} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \mathcal{R}_{l_j}$. Since $\dim \mathbb{V}^e \geqslant \dim \mathbb{V}^{\tilde{h}} \geqslant \dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}}$, the hypothesis implies that each $\mathcal{R}_{l_j}$ has a zero-weight space (hence each $l_j = 2k_j$ is even) and $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}} = \mathbb{V}^{\tilde{h}}$. Consequently, if $\nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})$ and $\nu \neq 0$, then $\nu(\tilde{h}) \neq 0$, which proves the partition formula. Letting $\mathbb{V}_\pm = \oplus_{\gamma\in\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_\pm}\mathbb{V}^\gamma$, we see that $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ generates $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}} \oplus \mathbb{V}_+$ as e-module, whence $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+ \subset Q_+$. Now, it is easily seen that if $\gamma \in Q_+$ is not proportional to a root, then there exists $w \in W$ such that $w(\gamma) \notin Q_+ \cup (-Q_+)$.

(ii) By the above decomposition of $\mathbb{V}|_{\mathfrak{s}}$, the multiset of positive $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{h}$-eigenvalues in $\mathbb{V}$, i.e., the multiset $\{\mathsf{ht}(\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+}\}$ consists of $\{1, 2, \dots, k_1,\ 1, 2, \dots, k_2,\ \dots,\ 1, 2, \dots, k_n\}$. Therefore, most of the factors cancel out in the LHS and we are left with the product $\prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1-q^{k_i+1}}{1-q}$.

On the other hand, the theory of R. Brylinski [7] shows that the generalised exponents of $\mathbb{V}$ are determined by the e-filtration on $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ and are equal to the $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{h}$-eigenvalues in $V^{\mathfrak{z}(e)}$, where $\mathfrak{z}(e)$ is the centraliser of e in $\mathfrak{g}$. Since $\dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{z}(e)} = \dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}}$ for the simple G-modules having zero weight [7, Cor. 2.7], it follows that $\mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{z}(e)} = \mathbb{V}^e$ in our situation, and the eigenvalues in question are $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n$. This yields the desired equality in part (ii). □

Remark 4.2. A formal consequence of relation (ii) is that the partition $\big(m_1(\lambda),\dots,m_n(\lambda)\big)$ is dual to the partition formed by the numbers $\#\{\gamma \in \widetilde{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+} \mid \mathsf{ht}(\gamma)=i\}$. For $\mathbb{V}=\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{V})_+=\Delta^+$, formula (ii) is sometimes called the Kostant-Macdonald identity, see [1]; we also refer to [2] for a recent generalisation related to Schubert varieties.

Remark 4.3. If $\mathbb{V}$ is a simple G-module with non-trivial zero-weight space, then

$$\dim \mathbb{V}^e \geqslant \dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{z}(e)} = \dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{t}} \leqslant \dim \mathbb{V}^{\tilde{h}}$$

and $\dim \mathbb{V}^e \geqslant \dim \mathbb{V}^{\tilde{h}}$. Therefore the hypothesis of Theorem 4.1 implies that all these spaces have one and the same dimension. It is also known that, for *any* simple G-module $\mathbb{V}$, $\dim \mathbb{V}^{\mathfrak{z}(e)}$ equals the dimension of a largest weight space, which is achieved for either the unique dominant minuscule weight or zero, see [8, Remark 1.6].

Making use of the above coincidences and Theorem 4.1(i), one easily proves that the hypothesis of the theorem holds exactly for the following pairs $(\mathfrak{g},\lambda)$ with simple $\mathfrak{g}$:

- $(\mathfrak{g},\theta)$ and $(\mathfrak{g},\theta_s)$, i.e., the adjoint and little adjoint representations of $\mathfrak{g}$;
- $(\mathbf{B}_r, 2\varphi_1)$, $(\mathbf{G}_2, 2\varphi_1)$, $(\mathbf{A}_1, 2m\varphi_1)$, $m\in\mathbb{N}$.

The generalised exponents for the first two cases in the second line are:

$2,4,\dots,2r$ and $2,4,6$, respectively.

References

[1] E. Akyildiz and J.B. Carrell. A generalization of the Kostant-Macdonald identity, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* (USA), **86** (1989), 3934–3937.

[2] E. Akyildiz and J.B. Carrell. Betti numbers of smooth Schubert varieties and the remarkable formula of Kostant, Macdonald, Shapiro, and Steinberg, *Michigan Math. J.*, **61** (2012), 543–553.

[3] Yu. Bazlov. Graded multiplicities in the exterior algebra, *Adv. Math.*, **158** (2001), 129–153.

[4] A. Broer. Line bundles on the cotangent bundle of the flag variety, *Invent. Math.*, **113** (1993), 1–20.

[5] A. Broer. Normality of some nilpotent varieties and cohomology of line bundles on the cotangent bundle of the flag variety, Brylinski, Jean-Luc (ed.) et al., "Lie theory and geometry" Boston, MA: Birkhäuser. Prog. Math. **123**, 1–19 (1994).

[6] A. Broer. A vanishing theorem for Dolbeault cohomology of homogeneous vector bundles, *J. reine angew. Math.*, **493** (1997), 153–169.

[7] R.K. Brylinski. Limits of weight spaces, Lusztig's q-analogs, and fiberings of adjoint orbits, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **2** (1989), 517–533.

[8] W.A. Graham. Functions on the universal cover of the principal nilpotent orbit, *Invent. Math.*, **108** (1992), 15–27.

[9] R.K Gupta. Characters and the q-analog of weight multiplicity, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **36** (1987), 68–76.

[10] R.K. Gupta. Generalized exponents via Hall-Littlewood symmetric functions, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **16** (1987), 287–291.

[11] W. Hesselink. Cohomology and the resolution of the nilpotent variety, *Math. Ann.*, **223**, no. 3 (1976), 249–252.

[12] W. Hesselink. Characters of the Nullcone, *Math. Ann.*, **252** (1980), 179–182.

[**13**] B. ION. The Cherednik kernel and generalized exponents, *IMRN*, 2004, no. 36, 1869–1895.

[**14**] S. KATO. Spherical functions and a q-analogue of Kostant's weight multiplicity formula, *Invent. Math.*, **66** (1982), 461–468.

[**15**] B. KOSTANT. The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the Betti numbers of a complex simple Lie group, *Amer. J. Math.* **81** (1959), 973–1032.

[**16**] B. KOSTANT. Lie group representations on polynomial rings, *Amer. J. Math.*, **85** (1963), 327–404.

[**17**] G. LUSZTIG. Singularities, character formulas, and a q-analog of weight multiplicities, *Analyse et topologie sur les espaces singuliers* (II–III), Astérisque 101–102 (Société Mathématique de France, Paris 1983), 208–227.

[**18**] D. PANYUSHEV. Weight multiplicity free representations, $\mathfrak{g}$-endomorphism algebras, and Dynkin polynomials, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **69**, Part 2 (2004), 273–290.

[**19**] D. PANYUSHEV. Generalised Kostka-Foulkes polynomials and cohomology of line bundles on homogeneous vector bundles, *Selecta Math.* (New Series), **16** (2010), 315–342.

[**20**] H. SAMELSON. "Notes on Lie Algebras", Second edition. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990. xii+162 pp.

[**21**] S. VISWANATH. A note on exponents vs root heights for complex simple Lie algebras, *Electron. J. Combin.*, **13** (2006), # N22, 5 pp.

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS OF THE R.A.S., BOL'SHOI KARETNYI PER. 19, 127994 MOSCOW, RUSSIA

INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITY OF MOSCOW, BOL'SHOI VLASEVSKII PER. 11, 119002 MOSCOW, RUSSIA

E-mail address: panyushev@iitp.ru